

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 SUMIT GARG,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO. CR21-0045-JCC

ORDER

14
15 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No.
16 791) of this Court's order denying his request to suppress testimony (Dkt. No. 780). Having
17 thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant's motion for the
18 reasons explained herein.

19 Under the Local Criminal Rules, “[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored.”
20 CrR12(b)(13)(A). “The Court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of
21 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
22 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.* “A motion for
23 reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought
24 through—rightly or wrongly.” *Ma v. Univ. of S. California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1
25 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

1 Here, Defendant fails to demonstrate manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of
2 new facts or legal authority, as required by LCR 7(h)(1). It is evident based on the pleadings that
3 Defendant misconstrues the Court's reasoning. Contrary to his suggestion, the Court made no
4 factual findings in denying his motion to suppress. Rather, it found that the testimony of his ex-
5 wife concerning his conduct prior to his incarceration could plausibly be of some import to the
6 Government's case.

7 Accordingly, Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 791) is DENIED.
8

9 DATED this 15th day of February 2024.

10 
11 John C. Coughenour
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE